UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/611,641	07/01/2003	Curtis G. Wong	MS303124.2 (MSFTP446USA)	1389	
	7590 10/09/200 CY & CALVIN, LLP	8	EXAMINER		
127 Public Squa	are		KE, PENG		
57th Floor, Key Tower CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2174		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/09/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/611,641	WONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SIMON KE	2174	

	SIMON KE	2174	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 September 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the lonowing rejection(s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	-	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Done: Mal		
	/Peng Ke/ Examiner, Art Unit 2174		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument focused on the following:

A) Whether the combination of Jacobi and Demers teaches a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely browse, manipulate and view a plurality of media items stored in the at least one media store by interfacing with the host component, the media frame display retrieves a plurality of media items form the host media store, stores them in a local store and transmits back to the host media store the at least one of modified media items, add and delete operations performed on the media items, wherein the local data store in operably connected to the interactive media frame display?

A) During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

In this case, the combination teaches this limitation because Jacobi teaches a media frame component that facilitates full interactivity by a user to remotely brose, manipulate, and view a plurality of media items stored the at in least one media store by interfacing with the host component via a communication connection between the media frame component and the host component by allowing user to select, view, and assign a desirability factor to the textual media (see Jacobi, column 4, lines 35-60; Web server provides the interactivities); and Demers teaches the media frame display retrieves a plurality of media items from the host media store, stores them in a local store and transmits back to the host media store the at least one of modified media items or add and delete operations performed on the media items, wherein the local data store is operably connected to the interactive media frame display by allowing user to download media from server to his/her local storage. (see Demers, paragraph 0074) Therefore the combination teaches this limitation.

B) Whether claims 34 and 35 recite a display cycle?

B) In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "display cycle") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993)..